

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,644	07/23/2003	Kyuichi Takimoto	030879	6904
23850 7	11/04/2005	EXAMINER		
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW			LAXTON, GARY L	
SUITE 1000		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20006		2838	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				_ \		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	The same of the sa		
		10/624,644 TAKIMOTO ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Gary L. Laxton	2838			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addres	's		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reper population of the provision of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed vs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commu D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status						
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A	lugust 2005.				
•		s action is non-final.				
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Application from the International Bureation See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receive tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Sta	ge		
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152	2)		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to applicant's first argument, that Bazinet et al seemingly only appears to generate the two signals with the same pulse widths. 1 The applicant goes on to advance a theory of how the pulse widths are not the same even though Bazinet et al expressly illustrates that they are the same. The examiner thanks the applicant for that opinion, but would rather rely on the concrete evidence of the reference cited. In fact, the applicant's argument concerning Bazinet et al could aptly be applied to the applicant's own circuit as well. Circuit components ultimately degrade signals as they travel throughout the circuit. Therefore, one could freely state that applicant's own circuit does not provide signals with exactly the same pulse width, since each signal will degrade differently from the other as they pass through different components. Additionally, what concerns the examiner, is the fact that the prior art reference Isham et al (US RE38.487) also discloses generating a first drive signal such that the first drive signal has the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal, as stated in the previous office action. Therefore, as the record suggests, it appears to be old and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art to generate a drive signal that has the same pulse width as that of a pulse signal, even though the applicant maintains that this is the novel

¹ Remarks dated 8/25/05, page 2 lines 4-7.

Art Unit: 2838

feature of the instant invention. Thus, the examiner is all the more reluctant to find this feature novel under those circumstances in spite of the applicant's argument.

Accordingly, the examiner has no other alternative except to maintain the rejections in this regard.

Secondly, the applicant argues that Bazinet et al do not switch the main switch and the synchronous switch ON and OFF alternately. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Clearly, as illustrated in figure 3, Bazinet et al switch the two switches alternately. Clearly, as shown, one switch switches ON while the other switch switches OFF (i.e. alternately). Thus, this argument appears baseless, and therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant on this issue and maintains the previous stated rejection on this issue as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 7, 14, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bazinet et al (US 5,627,460).

Claims 1, 2 and 7; Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, disclose a control circuit (30) for controlling an output voltage of a DC/DC converter (10), the DC/DC converter includes a main switching

² Remarks dated 8/25/05, page 2 lines 8-11.

Art Unit: 2838

element and a synchronous switching element (12, 14), the control circuit comprising: a pulse signal generation circuit (32) which generates a pulse (62) signal for controlling the DC/DC converter based on the output voltage (Vout); and a drive signal generation circuit (34) connected to the pulse signal generation circuit (32), the drive signal generation circuit generates first and second drive signals (38, 40) using the pulse signal for respective supply to the main switching element and the synchronous switching element such that the main switching element and the synchronous switching element are turned ON and OFF alternately at different timings, and the drive signal generation circuit generates the first drive signal such that the first drive signal has substantially the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal (see figure 3: 114, 116); furthermore, the drive signal generation circuit (34) generates the second drive signal such that the second drive signal has a larger pulse width than the first drive signal using the pulse signal and the first drive signal (see figure 3: 118).

Claims 14 and 15; Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, disclose a DC/DC converter comprising: a main switching element and a synchronous switching element (12, 14); a smoothing circuit (18, 20) connected to a node between the main switching element and the synchronous switching element, the smoothing circuit generating an output voltage; and a control circuit (30) which controls the output voltage by supplying a first drive signal to the main switching element and supplying a second drive signal to the synchronous switching element (38, 40), the control circuit including: a pulse signal generation circuit (34) which generates a pulse signal for controlling the output voltage based on the output voltage (Vout); and a drive signal generation circuit (34) connected to the pulse signal generation circuit, the drive signal generation circuit generating the first and second drive signals by using the pulse signal such that the main switching element and

Art Unit: 2838

the synchronous switching element are turned ON and OFF alternately at different timings, and the drive signal generation circuit (34) generating the first drive signal such that the first drive signal has substantially the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal (see figure 3: 116).

Claim 21; Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, disclose a method for controlling an output voltage (Vout) of a DC/DC converter (10), wherein the DC/DC converter includes a main switching element and a synchronous switching element (12, 14), the method comprising: generating a pulse signal (62) for controlling the output voltage of the DC/DC converter based on the output voltage (Vout); generating a first drive signal (38, 40) which has substantially the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal (figure 3: 116) and supplying the first drive signal to the main switching element (12, 14); and generating a second drive signal using the pulse signal and the first drive signal and supplying the second drive signal to the synchronous switching element such that the main switching element and the synchronous switching element are turned ON and OFF alternately at different timings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3, 8-10, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al (US 5,627,460) in view of Nishimaki (US 2004104714).

Page 6

Claims 3, 8-10 and 16; Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 1, 7 and 14 supra, except for the drive signal generation circuit includes: a first delay circuit which generates the first drive signal by delaying the pulse signal; a second delay circuit connected to the first delay circuit, the second delay circuit generating a delayed signal by delaying the first drive signal; and a synthesis circuit connected to the second delay circuit, and the synthesis circuit generating the second drive signal by synthesizing the pulse signal with the delayed signal.

Nishimaki, figure 8, teach a drive signal generation circuit (32) includes: a first delay circuit (327) which generates a first drive signal (14) by delaying a pulse signal (11); a second delay circuit (326) connected to the first delay circuit (327), the second delay circuit generating a delayed signal by delaying the first drive signal (14); and a synthesis circuit (321) connected to the second delay circuit (327), and the synthesis circuit generating the second drive signal (13) by synthesizing the pulse signal (11) with the delayed signal (326).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circuit of Bazinet et al to have a drive signal generation circuit that includes: a first delay circuit which generates the first drive signal by delaying the pulse signal; a second delay circuit connected to the first delay circuit, the second delay circuit generating a delayed signal by delaying the first drive signal; and a synthesis circuit connected to the second delay circuit, and the synthesis circuit generating as suggested by Nishimaki in order to provide a drive signal generation circuit that reduces power consumption (paragraph [0084]).

Claim 20; Bazinet et al figure 1 discloses the pulse signal generation circuit includes: an error amplification circuit (54) which compares the output voltage (Vout) and a reference voltage

Art Unit: 2838

(2.0v) to generate an error signal; and a comparison circuit (32) connected to the error amplification circuit, and the comparison circuit comparing the error signal and a triangular wave signal (Vramp) to generate a pulse signal having a pulse width proportional to the voltage of the error signal.

6. Claims 4, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al (US 5,627,460) and Nishimaki (US 2004104714) in view of Bridge (US 6,396,250).

Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, and Nishimaki disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 3, 10 and 16 supra, except for the first and second delay circuits each include a plurality of inverter circuits.

Bridge figure 13 teaches a delay circuit with a plurality of inverter circuits used to a delay a signal by a predetermined delay time set by the number of inverter circuits.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circuit combination of Bazinet et al and Nishimaki to provide first and second delay circuits each including a plurality of inverter circuits as taught by Bridge in order to delay a signal by a predetermined delay time set by the number of inverter circuits in the first and second delay circuits.

7. Claims 5, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al (US 5,627,460) and Nishimaki (US 2004104714) in view of Matsuda (US 4,862,364).

Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, and Nishimaki disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 3, 10 and 16 supra, except for the first and second delay circuits each include an integrating circuit having a resistor and a capacitor.

Matsuda teaches a delay circuit (28) using a capacitor and resistor as an integrator circuit in order to delay a signal to a differential amplifier circuit where the delay is determined by the time constant of the integrator circuit (col. 3 lines 35-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circuit combination of Bazinet et al and Nishimaki to provide for the first and second delay circuits to each include an integrating circuit having a resistor and a capacitor in order to delay the signal according to the time constant of the resistor and capacitor combination.

8. Claims 6, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al (US 5,627,460) and Nishimaki (US 2004104714) in view of Jain et al (US 6,577,517).

Bazinet et al, figures 1-3, and Nishimaki disclose the claimed subject matter in regards to claims 3, 10 and 16 supra, except for the synthesis circuit includes a NOR circuit.

Jain et al, figure 7, teaches using synthesizing circuitry in combination with delay circuitry that includes the use of NOR gates to synthesize the signals therein.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circuit combination of Bazinet et al and Nishimaki to

Art Unit: 2838

provide a synthesis circuit that includes a NOR circuit in order to synthesize the signals according to the logic of a NOR gate as taught by Jain et al.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2838

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary L. Laxton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry can be reached on (571) 272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gary L. Laxton Primary Examiner Art Unit 2838